UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/720,633 | 11/24/2003 | Mahesh Rajagopalan | 03-1021 | 4254 | |
| | 7590 12/06/2010 GAL DEPARTMENT | 0 | EXAMINER | | |
| | AGEMENT GROUP | GAY, SONIA L | | | |
| 1320 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD 9TH FLOOR | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| ARLINGTON, | VA 22201-2525 | | 2614 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 12/06/2010 | ELECTRONIC | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@VERIZON.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|--|--|
| 10/720,633 | RAJAGOPALAN ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| SONIA GAY | 2614 | | |

| | SONIA GAY | 2614 | |
|---|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 11 November 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS | APPLICATION IN CONDITION F | OR ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ao no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la | ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | date of the final rejection | n. |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | 7). | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl | liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t | filed within two months | s of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. 🛛 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b | out prior to the date of filing a brief, | will <u>not</u> be entered be | cause |
| (a) $oxed{\boxtimes}$ They raise new issues that would require further cor | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | |
| (b) ☑ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belov | ** | | |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or | er form for appeal by materially red | lucing or simplifying th | ne issues for |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11 | | otou olalino. | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | , | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324) |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mphane, anonamone (i | 1 02 02 1). |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all | | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| non-allowable claim(s). | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | l be entered and an ex | xplanation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | 0.440.440.445.400 | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14,17-31,33,34,36-39,52-65,68-82,84</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | <u>,85,87-90,103,104,106,107,109,11</u> | <u>0,112,113,115-128</u> . | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but | before or on the date of filing a No | tice of Appeal will not | be entered |
| because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | ıl and/or appellant fails | s to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | • | | |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but Since applicant's arguments are based on the newly ame | | | |
| arguments are moot. | DTO/SB/08) Bonor No/o) | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: | г т О/Эв/00) Рарег NO(\$) | | |
| /Ahmad F Matar/ | /Sonia Gay/ | | |
| Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614 | Examiner, Art Unit 2614 | | |
| • | =/tallillor, / it Offic 2014 | | |

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claims 1, 17, 52, 68, 103, 104, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 113 now recite the limitation "overriden without condition". First, paragraph 98 of the specification discloses that the call "may not be directed to the preferred device in the override mode". Since the phrase "may not" can indicate possibility and there is no further indiction of conditions as relates to this override mode in the specification, the new claim limitation appears to be unsupported by the original specification. Second, the new claim limitation requires further consideration and search.